

REMARKS

Detailed response to items of Reference B Office Action includes the following.

Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 112

Regarding items 1-2 of Reference B Office Action, claims 2-4, 8-9 and 13-18 have
5 been amended to delete the term “articulated” in favor of the term “formed” to overcome
rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

Applicant had intended the Webster definition “to form into a systematic whole” for
the term “articulate” and had included a paragraph incorporating such definition in the
application. A definition of “articulate” that includes “to form” was thereby included in
10 the application.

Applicant submits that the term “articulate” would be more appropriate and
descriptive for the purposes intended and defined in this application, but that either term
would be adequate. However, Applicant yields to wisdom and purposes expressed in the
Reference B Office Action by amending the application to replace “articulate” with “form”.

15 *Claim Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. 102*

Regarding items 3-4 of Reference B Office Action, it is submitted that claims 1-20
as amended by new claims 21-40 are not anticipated by cited reference Richie et al (US-
6,132,366) under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) for reasons that include the following:

Instead of a two-vagina-insertion device, Richie et al taught a small three-inch rod
20 (14) with a “group of stimulation devices designed for anal and/or vaginal stimulation” for
use by only one female at a time. Richie et al’s “cone-shaped tip (58) for anal insertion” on
the rod (14) is not an anal anchor (4) taught by Applicant because it does not describe
anchor structure with a circular base (7) extended radially from an anal-anchor protrusion,
rendering it suitable only for anal stimulation as limited by Richie et al. The cone-shaped

tip is described as a “tip” for anal stimulation, not an anchor. Regardless of how structured or formed, Richie et al’s cone-shaped tip is not structured, described or usable in working relationship to an insertion shaft (1) and a vaginal anchor (5) taught by Applicant for use by two females. A “cone-shaped vaginal inserter (64)” and “two parallel short rods (66, 68) adjacent the second end (of the rod 14) (are) for clitoral stimulation”, not for vaginal insertion into two vaginas. Richie et al did not teach Applicant’s insertion shaft (1), anal anchor (4), vaginal anchor (5) or any of the form and structure for two-vagina insertion with vaginal and anal double-anchorage to one female as taught by Applicant.

Information Disclosure Statement

Regarding item 5 of Reference B Office Action, Applicant hereby requests that the disclosure under OTHER DOCUMENTS in the INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION filed with this application be deleted because it did not meet address and date requirements for a disclosure under provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609.

Prior Art Made Of Record And Not Relied Upon

Regarding item 5 of Reference B Office Action, prior art made of record and not relied upon has been reviewed and found not to anticipate this application. Neither Jacobs (US-5,853,362), Kain (US-5,690,603) nor Sekulich (US-3996,930) teach or disclose Applicant’s vaginal insertion shaft (1), anal anchor (4), vaginal anchor (5) or any of the form and structure for two-female vaginal insertion with vaginal and anal anchorage to one of the females.

CONCLUSION

In light of factors that include the above, it is requested that this application as amended and described in new claims 21-40 be reconsidered for allowance.